FILED KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) 1 United States Attorney 2 FEB X 1 2006 EUMI L. CHOI (WVBN 0722) 3 Chief. Criminal Division RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JOSEPH A. FAZIOLI (ILSBN 6273413) 4 Assistant United States Attorney 5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102-3495 6 Telephone: (415) 436-7129 FAX: (415) 436-7234 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 12 13 CR 04-0189 VRW No. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 14 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ADJUSTING MOTION Plaintiff, 15 BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND EXCLUDING TIME FROM THE SPEEDY 16 v. TRIAL ACT CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)) 17 REY MARTINEZ, Defendant. 18 19 This matter is currently for hearing on defendant's motion to suppress on February 14, 20 2006. The parties now jointly request that the briefing schedule and hearing date in this matter 21 be adjusted. This joint request is a result of scheduling issues that have arisen after the setting of 22 the briefing schedule related to pre-existing professional commitments, a recently completed trial 23 and witness availability. Furthermore, the government has recently provided additional 24 discovery materials to the defense which are under review. The parties would like an opportunity 25 to confer regarding this additional discovery prior to the hearing on defendant's pre-trial motion. 26 27 It is the parties' understanding that the Court is available on March 7, 2006. 28 In light of the above, the parties agree, and the Court finds and holds, as follows: STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER CR 04-0189 VRW

1	1.	Government's response to defendant's motion to suppress is due no later than Monday,
2	February 13, 2006.	
3	2.	Defendant's reply is due no later than Thursday, February 23, 2006.
4	3.	The hearing on defendant's motion to suppress shall take place on Tuesday, March 7,
5		2006.
6	4.	The time between February 14, 2006 and March 7, 2006 is excluded under the Speedy
7	Trial Act. The parties agree that the failure to grant the requested continuance would	
8	unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking	
9	into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties agree	
10	that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of	
11	the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases.	
12	Sce 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).	
13		
14	STIPU	LATED:
15	DATE	D: 1/30/06 BULL FAZIO
16		Attorney for Defendant Martinez
17		
18	DATE	0: 1/30/06 /5 / FAZOUL
19		Assistant United States Attorney
20	IT IS S	O ORDERED.
21	DATE	VIV a
22		VAUGHN R. WALKER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23		OTTALE DIVITED DIDITAGE VODGE
24		
25		
26		

27

28